arXiv:1401.5411v1 [math.AP] 21 Jan 2014

BLOWING-UP SOLUTIONS CONCENTRATING ALONG MINIMAL SUBMANIFOLDS FOR SOME SUPERCRITICAL ELLIPTIC PROBLEMS ON RIEMANNIAN MANIFOLDS

MARCO GHIMENTI, ANNA MARIA MICHELETTI, ANGELA PISTOIA

Abstract. Let (M,g) and (K,κ) be two Riemannian manifolds of dimensions m and k, respectively. Let $\omega \in C^2(N)$, $\omega > 0$. The warped product $M \times_\omega K$ is the $(m+k)$-dimensional product manifold $M \times K$ furnished with metric $g + \omega^2\kappa$. We prove that the supercritical problem

$$-\Delta_{g+\omega^2\kappa} u + hu = u^{\frac{m+2}{m-2}\pm\varepsilon},\ u > 0,\ \text{in } (M \times_\omega K, g + \omega^2\kappa)$$

has a solution which concentrate along a k-dimensional minimal submanifold Γ of $M \times_\omega N$ as the real parameter ε goes to zero, provided the function h and the sectional curvatures along Γ satisfy a suitable condition.

Keywords: supercritical problem, concentration along minimal submanifold
AMS subject classification: 35B10, 35B33, 35J08, 58J05

1. Introduction and statement of main results

We deal with the semilinear elliptic equation

$$-\Delta_{\mathfrak{g}} u + hu = u^{p-1},\ u > 0,\ \text{in } (\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{g}) \tag{1.1}$$

where $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{g})$ is a $n-$dimensional compact Riemannian manifold without boundary, h is a C^1-real function on $\mathcal{M}$ s.t. $-\Delta_{\mathfrak{g}} + h$ is coercive and $p > 2$.

The compactness of the embedding $H^1_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{M}) \hookrightarrow L^p_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{M})$ for any $p \in (2, 2^*_n)$ where $2^*_n := \frac{2n}{n-2}$ if $n \geq 3$ and $2^*_n := +\infty$ if $n = 2$, ensures that

$$\inf_{\substack{u \in H^1_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{M}) \\ u \neq 0}} \frac{\int_{\mathcal{M}} \left(|\nabla_{\mathfrak{g}} u|^2 + hu^2\right) d\mu_{\mathfrak{g}}}{\left(\int_{\mathcal{M}} |u|^p d\mu_{\mathfrak{g}}\right)^{2/p}}$$

is achieved and so problem (1.1) has always a solution for any $p \in (2, 2^*_n)$.

In the critical case, i.e. $p = 2^*_n$, the situation turns out to be more complicated. In particular, the existence of solutions is related to the position of the potential h with respect to the geometric potential $h_g := \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_{\mathfrak{g}}$, where $S_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is the scalar curvature of the manifold. If $h \equiv h_{\mathfrak{g}}$, then problem (1.1) is referred to as the Yamabe problem and it has always a solution (see Aubin [1, 2], Schoen [10], Trudinger [11], and Yamabe [12] for early references on the subject). When $h < h_{\mathfrak{g}}$ somewhere in $\mathcal{M}$, existence of a solution is guaranteed by a minimization argument (see for example Aubin [1, 2]). The situation is extremely delicate when $h \geq h_{\mathfrak{g}}$ because blow-up phenomena can occur as pointed out by Druet in [6, 7].
The supercritical case $p > 2^*_n$ is even more difficult to deal with. A first result in this direction is a perturbative result due to Micheletti, Pistoia and Vétois [9]. They consider the almost critical problem (1.1) when $p = 2^*_n \pm \varepsilon$, i.e. if $p = 2^*_n - \varepsilon$ the problem (1.1) is slightly subcritical and if $p = 2^*_n + \varepsilon$ the problem (1.1) is slightly supercritical. They prove the following results.

Theorem 1. *Assume $n \geq 6$ and $\xi_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ is a non degenerate critical point of $h - \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_{\mathfrak{g}}$. Then*

(i) *if $h(\xi_0) > \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_{\mathfrak{g}}(\xi_0)$ then the slightly subcritical problem (1.1) with $p = 2^*_n - 1 - \varepsilon$, has a solutions u_ε which concentrates at ξ_0,*

(ii) *if* $h(\xi_0) < \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_{\mathfrak{g}}(\xi_0)$ *then the slightly supercritical problem* (1.1) *with* $p = 2_n^* - 1 - \varepsilon$, *has a solutions* u_ε *which concentrates at* ξ_0 *as* $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Now, for any integer $0 \le k \le n-3$ let $2_{n,k}^* = \frac{2(n-k)}{n-k-2}$ be the $(k+1)-$*st critical exponent.* We remark that $2_{n,k}^* = 2_{n-k,0}^*$ is nothing but the critical exponent for the Sobolev embedding $\mathrm{H}^1_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{M}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{L}^q_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{M})$, when $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{g})$ is a $(n-k)-$dimensional Riemannian manifold. In particular, $2_{n,0}^* = \frac{2n}{n-2}$ is the usual Sobolev critical exponent.
We can summarize the results proved by Micheletti, Pistoia and Vétois just saying that problem (1.1) when $p \to 2_{n,0}^*$ (i.e. $k = 0$) has positive solutions blowing-up at points. Note that a point is a $0-$dimensional manifold! Therefore, a natural question arises: *does problem* (1.1) *have solutions blowing-up at* $k-$*dimensional submanifolds when* $p \to 2_{n,k}^*$*?*

In the present paper, we give a positive answer when $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{g})$ is a warped product manifold.

We recall the notion of warped product introduced by Bishop and O'Neill in [3]. Let (M, g) and (K, κ) be two riemannian manifolds of dimensions m and k, respectively. Let $\omega \in C^2(M)$, $\omega > 0$ be a differentiable function. The warped product $\mathcal{M} = M \times_\omega K$ is the product (differentiable) $n-$dimensional ($n := m + k$) manifold $M \times K$ furnished with the riemannian metric is $\mathfrak{g} = g + \omega^2 \kappa$. ω is called *warping function.* For example, every surface of revolution (not crossing the axis of revolution) is isometric to a warped product, with M the generating curve, $K = S^1$ and $\omega(x)$ the distance from $x \in M$ to the axis of revolution.

It is not difficult to check that if $u \in C^2(M \times_\omega K)$ then

$$\Delta_{\mathfrak{g}} u = \Delta_g u + \frac{m}{\omega} g\left(\nabla_g f, \nabla_g u\right) + \frac{1}{\omega^2} \Delta_\kappa u. \tag{1.2}$$

Assume h is invariant with respect to K, i.e. $h(x, y) = h(x)$ for any $(x, y) \in M \times K$. If we look for solutions to (1.1) which are invariant with respect to K, i.e. $u(x, y) = v(x)$ then by (1.2) we immediately deduce that u solves (1.1) if and only if v solves

$$-\Delta_g v - \frac{m}{\omega} g\left(\nabla_g f, \nabla_g v\right) + hv = v^{p-1} \quad \text{in } (M, g). \tag{1.3}$$

or equivalently

$$-\operatorname{div}_g\left(\omega^m \nabla_g v\right) + \omega^m h v = \omega^m v^{p-1},\ v > 0 \quad \text{in } (M, g). \tag{1.4}$$

Here we are interested in studying problem (1.4) when the exponent p approaches the higher critical exponent $2_{n,k}^* = 2_m^*$, i.e. $p = 2_m^* - \varepsilon$ for some small real parameter ε. It is clear that if v is a solution to problem (1.3) which concentrates at a point $\xi_0 \in M$ then $u(x, y) = v(x)$ is a solution to problems (1.1) which concentrates along the fiber $\{\xi_0\} \times K$, which is a $k-$dimensional submanifold of M. It is important to notice the the fiber $\{\xi_0\} \times K$ is totally geodesic in $M \times_\omega K$ (and in particular a minimal submanifold of $M \times_\omega K$) if ξ_0 is a critical point of the warping function ω.

Therefore, we are lead to study the more general anisotropic almost critical problem

$$-\operatorname{div}_g\left(a(x) \nabla_g u\right) + a(x) h u = a(x) u^{\frac{m+2}{m-2} - \varepsilon},\ u > 0 \quad \text{in } (M, g) \tag{1.5}$$

where (M, g) is a $m-$dimensional compact Riemannian manifolds, $a \in C^2(M)$ with $\min_M a > 0$, $h \in C^2(M)$ such that the anisotropic operator $-\operatorname{div}_g\left(a(x)\nabla_g u\right) + a(x)hu$ is coercive and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$.

Our main result reads as follows.

Theorem 2. *Assume* $m \ge 9$ *and* $\xi_0 \in M$ *is a non degenerate critical point of* a. *Then*

(i) *if* $h(\xi_0) > \frac{m-2}{4(m-1)} S_g(\xi_0) - \frac{3(m-2)}{2(m-1)} \frac{\Delta_g a(\xi_0)}{a(\xi_0)}$ *then if* $\varepsilon > 0$ *is small enough the slightly subcritical problem* (1.5) *has a solutions* u_ε *which concentrates at* ξ_0 *as* $\varepsilon \to 0$,

(ii) *if* $h(\xi_0) < \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} S_g(\xi_0) - \frac{3(m-2)}{2(m-1)} \frac{\Delta_g a(\xi_0)}{a(\xi_0)}$ *then if* $\varepsilon < 0$ *is small enough then the slightly supercritical problem* (1.5) *has a solutions* u_ε *which concentrates at* ξ_0 *as* $\varepsilon \to 0$.

In particular, Theorem 2 applies to the case $a = \omega^m$ where ω is the warping function. We recall that if ξ_0 is a critical point of the warping function ω, then the fiber $\Gamma := \{\xi_0\} \times K$ is a minimal $k-$dimensional submanifold of the warped product manifold $\mathcal{M} \times_\omega K$ equipped with the metric $\mathfrak{g} = g + \omega^2 \kappa$. Let

$$\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}}(\Gamma) := \frac{m-2}{4(m-1)} S_g(\xi_0) - \frac{3m(m-2)}{2(m-1)} \frac{\Delta_g \omega(\xi_0)}{\omega(\xi_0)},$$

which turns out to be a weighted mean of sectional curvatures of Γ. From the above discussion and Theorem 2 we immediately deduce the following result concerning the supercritical problem (1.1).

Theorem 3. *Assume $m \geq 9$, h is invariant with respect to K and $p = 2^*_m - \varepsilon$.*

(i) *if $h(\Gamma) > \Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}}(\Gamma)$, then if $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough the supercritical problem (1.1) has a solutions u_ε, invariant with respect to K, which concentrates along Γ as $\varepsilon \to 0$,*

(ii) *if $h(\Gamma) < \Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}}(\Gamma)$, then if $\varepsilon < 0$ is small enough then the supercritical problem (1.1) has a solutions u_ε invariant with respect to K, which concentrates along Γ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.*

Let us state some open problems about the anisotropic problem (1.5).

(a) Theorem 2 holds true when $m \geq 9$. The interesting question concerns the low dimensions $m = 3, \dots, 8$. For example, one could ask if the results obtained by Druet [6, 7] for the Yamabe problem in low dimensions are true anymore.

(b) Theorem 2 holds true when the potential h is different from the geometric potential $\Sigma(\Gamma)$. It is interesting to see what happens when h coincides somewhere with $\Sigma(\Gamma)$. In particular, it could be interesting to obtain similar results to the ones obtained by Esposito-Pistoia-Vetóis [8] for the Yamabe problem.

(c) Theorem 2 concerns the case p close to 2^*_m but different from it. Is it possible to establish an existence result for the pure critical case $p = 2^*_m$ similar to the results obtained for the Yamabe problem?

Finally, we ask if similar results hold true in the non symmetric case. More precisely, if $p \to 2^*_{m,k}$ for some integer $k \geq 1$ does there exist a solution to problem (1.1) which blows-up along a minimal $k-$dimensional submanifold Γ provided the potential h is different from a suitable weighted mean of sectional curvatures of Γ? Recently, Davila-Pistoia-Vaira [4] gave a positive answer when $k = 1$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the necessary framework. In Section 4 we reduce the problem to a finite dimensional one, via a Ljapunov-Schmidt reduction and in Section 5 we study the finite dimensional problem and we prove Theorem 2.

2. Setting of the problem

Let H the Hilbert space $H^1_g(M)$ endowed with the scalar product

$$\langle u, v \rangle_H = \int_M a(x) \nabla_g u \nabla_g v d\mu_g + \int_M a(x) h(x) u v d\mu_g.$$

Let $\| \cdot \|_H$ be the norm induced by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_H$, which is equivalent to the usual one. We also denote the usual L^q-norm of a function $u \in L^q_g(M)$ by

$$|u|_g = \left(\int_M |u|^q d\mu_g \right)^{1/q}.$$

Let $i^*_H : L^{\frac{2m}{m+2}}_g(M) \to H$ be the adjoint operator of the embedding $i : H \to L^{2^*_m}_g(M)$, that is

$$\begin{aligned} u = i^*_H(v) \quad &\Leftrightarrow \quad \langle i^*_H(v), \varphi \rangle_H = \int_M v \varphi d\mu_g \quad \forall \varphi \in H \\ &\Leftrightarrow \quad \int_M a(x) \nabla_g u \nabla_g \varphi d\mu_g + \int_M a(x) h(x) u \varphi d\mu_g = \int_M v \varphi d\mu_g \quad \forall \varphi \in H \end{aligned}$$

We recall (see [9]) the following inequality

$$|i_H^*(w)|_s \leq C\,|w|_{\frac{ms}{m+2s}} \text{ for } w \in L^{\frac{ms}{m+2s}} \tag{2.1}$$

where $s > \frac{2m}{m-2} = 2_m^*$ so that $\frac{ms}{m+2s} > \frac{2m}{m+2}$.

We consider the Banach space $H_\varepsilon = H_g^1(M) \cap L_g^{s_\varepsilon}(M)$ with the norm

$$\|u\|_{H_\varepsilon} = \|u\|_H + |u|_{s_\varepsilon}$$

where we set

$$s_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} 2_m^* - \frac{m}{2}\varepsilon & \text{if } \varepsilon < 0 \\ 2_m^* & \text{if } \varepsilon > 0 \end{cases}$$

We remark that in the subcritical case $\varepsilon > 0$ the space H_ε is nothing but the space $H_g^1(M)$ with norm $\|\cdot\|_H$. By (2.1), we easily deduce that

$$\|i_H^*(w)\|_{H_\varepsilon} \leq c|w|_{\frac{ms_\varepsilon}{m+2s_\varepsilon}} \text{ if } w \in L^{\frac{ms_\varepsilon}{m+2s_\varepsilon}}. \tag{2.2}$$

Finally, we can rewrite Equation (1.5) as

$$u = i_H^*(a(x)f_\varepsilon(u)) \quad u \in \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon \tag{2.3}$$

where $f_\varepsilon(u) = (u^+)^{2^*-1-\varepsilon}$ and $u^+ = \max\{u, 0\}$.

Now, let us introduce the main ingredient to build a solution to problem (2.3), namely the standard bubble

$$U(z) := \frac{\alpha_m}{(1+|z|^2)^{\frac{m-2}{2}}} \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^m$$

where $\alpha_m := (m(m-2))^{\frac{m-2}{4}}$. It is well known that the functions

$$U_{\delta,y}(z) := \delta^{-\frac{m-2}{2}} U\left(\frac{z-y}{\delta}\right), z, y \in \mathbb{R}^m,\ \delta > 0$$

are all the positive solutions to the critical problem $-\Delta U = U^{2_m^*-1}$ on $\mathbb{R}^m$.

We are going to read the euclidean bubble $U_{\delta,y}$ on the manifold M via geodesic coordinates. Let χ be a smooth cut-off function such that $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$, $\chi(z) = 1$ if $z \in B(0, r/2) \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, $\chi(z) = 0$ if $z \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus B(0, r)$, $|\nabla\chi| \leq 2/r$, where r is the iniectivity radius of M. Let us define on M the function

$$W_{\delta,\eta}(x) = \begin{cases} \chi(\exp_{\xi_0}^{-1}(x))\delta^{-\frac{m-2}{2}} U(\delta^{-1}\exp_{\xi_0}^{-1}(x) - \eta) & \text{if } x \in B_g(\xi_0, r) \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in M \setminus B_g(\xi, r) \end{cases}. \tag{2.4}$$

We will look for a solution of (2.3) or, equivalently of (1.5), as $u = W_{\delta,\eta} + \Phi$, where

$$\delta = \delta_\varepsilon(t) = \sqrt{|\varepsilon|}t \text{ for some } t > 0 \text{ and } \eta \in \mathbb{R}^m. \tag{2.5}$$

We remark that as ε goes to 0 the function $W_{\delta,\eta}$ blows-up at the point ξ_0. The remainder term Φ belongs to the space $K_{\delta,\eta}^\perp$, which is introduced as follows. It is well known that any solution to the linearized equation

$$-\Delta\psi = (2_m^* - 1)U^{2_m^*-2}\psi$$

is a linear combination of the functions

$$V_0(z) = \frac{\partial}{\partial\delta}\left[\delta^{-\frac{m-2}{2}}U(\delta^{-1}z)\right]\Big|_{\delta=1} \qquad V_i(z) = \frac{\partial U}{\partial z_i}(z)\ i = 1, \ldots, m.$$

Let us define on M the functions

$$Z_{\delta,\eta}^i(x) = \begin{cases} \chi(\exp_{\xi_0}^{-1}(x))\delta^{-\frac{m-2}{2}} V_i(\delta^{-1}\exp_{\xi_0}^{-1}(x) - \eta) & \text{if } x \in B_g(\xi_0, r) \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in M \setminus B_g(\xi, r) \end{cases}.$$

Let us introduce the spaces $K_{\delta,\eta} = \text{span}\left\langle Z_{\delta,\eta}^0, \ldots, Z_{\delta,\eta}^m \right\rangle$ and

$$K_{\delta,\eta}^\perp = \left\{\Phi \in H_\varepsilon \ :\ \left\langle \Phi, Z_{\delta,\eta}^i \right\rangle_H = 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, m\right\}.$$

In order to solve problem (2.3) we will solve the couple of equations

$$\pi_{\delta,\eta}\left(W_{\delta,\xi} + \Phi - i_H^*(af_\varepsilon(W_{\delta,\eta} + \Phi))\right) = 0 \tag{2.6}$$

$$\pi^{\perp}_{\delta,\eta}\left(W_{\delta,\eta}+\Phi-i^*_H(af_\varepsilon(W_{\delta,\eta}+\Phi))\right)=0 \tag{2.7}$$

where $\pi_{\delta,\eta}: H_\varepsilon \to K_{\delta,\eta}$ and $\pi^{\perp}_{\delta,\eta}: H_\varepsilon \to K^{\perp}_{\delta,\eta}$ are the orthogonal projection and $\Phi \in \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon \cap K^{\perp}_{\delta,\eta}$.

3. The finite dimensional reduction

First of all, we solve equation (2.7). We set

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{\varepsilon,\delta,\eta}(\Phi) &:= \pi^{\perp}_{\delta,\eta}\left\{\Phi - i^*_H\left(a(x)f'_\varepsilon(W_{\delta,\eta})[\Phi]\right)\right\}\\
N_{\varepsilon,\delta,\eta}(\Phi) &:= \pi^{\perp}_{\delta,\eta}\left\{i^*_H\left(a(x)\left(f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta,\eta}+\Phi)-f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta,\eta})-f'_\varepsilon(W_{\delta,\eta})[\Phi]\right)\right)\right\}\\
R_{\varepsilon,\delta,\eta} &:= \pi^{\perp}_{\delta,\eta}\left\{i^*_H\left(a(x)f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta,\eta})\right)-W_{\delta,\eta}\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

so equation (2.7) reads as

$$L_{\varepsilon,\delta,\eta}(\Phi)=N_{\varepsilon,\delta,\eta}(\Phi)+R_{\varepsilon,\delta,\eta} \tag{3.1}$$

Lemma 4. *For any real numbers α and β with $0<\alpha<\beta$, there exists a positive constant $C_{\alpha,\beta}$ such that, for ε small, for any $\eta\in\mathbb{R}^m$, any real number $t\in[\alpha,\beta]$ and any $\Phi\in\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon\cap K^{\perp}_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}$ it holds*

$$\|L_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(\Phi)\|_{H,s_\varepsilon}\geq C_{\alpha,\beta}\|\Phi\|_{H,s_\varepsilon} \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. The proof is the same of [[9] Lemma 3.1] which we refers to □

Lemma 5. *If $m\geq 9$, for any real numbers α and β with $0<\alpha<\beta$, there exists a positive constant $C_{\alpha,\beta}$ such that, for ε small enough, for any $\eta\in\mathbb{R}^m$, any real number $t\in[\alpha,\beta]$*

$$\|R_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\|_{H,s_\varepsilon}\leq C_{\alpha,\beta}|\varepsilon|\,|\log|\varepsilon||$$

Proof. By definition of i^*_H and (2.2)

$$\|R_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\|_{H,s_\varepsilon}\leq c\|a(x)f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta})+a(x)\Delta_g W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\nabla_g a(x)\nabla_g W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}-a(x)hW_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\|_{\frac{ms_\varepsilon}{m+2s_\varepsilon}}$$

Using [[9], Lemma 3.2], by direct computation it is easy to prove that

$$\|f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta})+\Delta_g W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}-hW_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\|_{\frac{ms_\varepsilon}{m+2s_\varepsilon}}\leq C_{\alpha,\beta}|\varepsilon|\,|\log|\varepsilon||\,.$$

It remains to estimate the term

$$\|\nabla_g a\nabla_g W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\|_{\frac{ms_\varepsilon}{m+2s_\varepsilon}}.$$

Since ξ_0 is a critical point for the function a we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_g a\nabla_g W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\|^q_q &\leq C\max_{1\leq j\leq m}\int_{|y|<r}|y|^q\left|\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}\left(\chi(y)\delta^{-\frac{m-2}{2}}U\left(\frac{y}{\delta}-\eta\right)\right)\right|^q|g(y)|^{\frac12}dy\\
&\leq C\max_{1\leq j\leq m}\int_{|y|<r}|y|^q\left|\delta^{-\frac{m-2}{2}}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}\chi(y)U\left(\frac{y}{\delta}-\eta\right)\right|^q dy\\
&+C\max_{1\leq j\leq m}\int_{|y|<r}|y|^q\left|\delta^{-\frac{m-2}{2}}\chi(y)\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}U\left(\frac{y}{\delta}-\eta\right)\right|^q dy\\
&\leq C\max_{1\leq j\leq m}\int_{\frac{r}{2\delta}\leq|z|\leq\frac{r}{\delta}}|\delta z|^q\left|\delta^{-\frac{m-2}{2}}U\left(z-\eta\right)\right|^q\delta^m dz\\
&+C\max_{1\leq j\leq m}\int_{|z|\leq\frac{r}{\delta}}|\delta z|^q\left|\delta^{-\frac{m}{2}}\frac{\partial U}{\partial z_j}\left(z-\eta\right)\right|^q\delta^m dz\\
&\leq C\delta^{\frac{m-2}{2}q}+C\delta^{m+q-\frac{m}{2}q}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\|\nabla_g a\nabla_g W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\|_q\leq\delta^2, \tag{3.3}$$

because $m\geq 9$ and if $q=\frac{ms_\varepsilon}{m+2s_\varepsilon}$ then $1-\frac{m}{2}+\frac{m}{q}=2$ if $\varepsilon>0$ or $1-\frac{m}{2}+\frac{m}{q}$ close to 2 if $\varepsilon<0$ and sufficiently small. This concludes the proof. □

Proposition 6. *If $m \geq 9$, for any real numbers α and β with $0 < \alpha < \beta$, there exists a positive constant $C_{\alpha,\beta}$ such that, for ε small enough, for any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^m$, any real number $t \in [\alpha, \beta]$, there exists a unique solution $\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta} \in H_\varepsilon \cap K^\perp_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}$ of equation (2.7) such that*

$$\|\Phi_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\|_{H,s_\varepsilon} \leq C_{\alpha,\beta}|\varepsilon|\,|\log|\varepsilon||\,.$$

Moreover $\Phi_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}$ is continuously differentiable with respect to t and η.

Proof. In order to solve equation (2.7) we look for a fixed point for the operator

$$T_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta} = T : H_\varepsilon \cap K^\perp_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta} \to H_\varepsilon \cap K^\perp_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}$$

defined by

$$T_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(\Phi) = L^{-1}_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\left\{N_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(\Phi) + R_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right\}.$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\|T_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(\Phi)\|_{H,s_\varepsilon} &\leq \|N_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(\Phi)\|_{H,s_\varepsilon} + \|R_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\|_{H,s_\varepsilon}\\ \|T_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(\Phi_1) - T_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(\Phi_2)\|_{H,s_\varepsilon} &\leq \|N_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(\Phi_1) - N_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(\Phi_2)\|_{H,s_\varepsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $m \geq 9$ a simple application of mean value theorem gives

$$|f_\varepsilon(x+y) - f_\varepsilon(x+z) - f'_\varepsilon(x)(y-z)| \leq C|y-z|\,[|y|+|z|]\,[x+|y|+|z|]^{2^*_m-3-\varepsilon}$$

for all $x > 0$, $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}&\|N_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(\Phi_1) - N_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(\Phi_2)\|_{H,s_\varepsilon}\\ &\leq \|f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_1) - f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_2) - f'_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta})(\Phi_1-\Phi_2)\|_{\frac{ms_\varepsilon}{m+2s_\varepsilon}}\\ &\leq C\|\Phi_1-\Phi_2\|_{\beta_\varepsilon}\left[\|\Phi_1\|_{\beta_\varepsilon} + \|\Phi_2\|_{\beta_\varepsilon}\right] \times \left[\|W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\|_{\beta_\varepsilon} + \|\Phi_1\|_{\beta_\varepsilon} + \|\Phi_2\|_{\beta_\varepsilon}\right]^{2^*_m-3-\varepsilon} \qquad (3.4)\end{aligned}$$

where $\beta_\varepsilon = \frac{ms_\varepsilon}{m+2s_\varepsilon}(2^*-1-\varepsilon)$, so $\beta_\varepsilon = s_\varepsilon$ if $\varepsilon < 0$ or $\beta_\varepsilon = 2^*_m - \varepsilon\frac{2m}{m+2}$ if $\varepsilon > 0$.

In particular

$$\begin{aligned}\|N_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(\Phi_1)\|_{H,s_\varepsilon} &\leq \|f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_1) - f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}) - f'_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta})(\Phi_1)\|_{\frac{ms_\varepsilon}{m+2s_\varepsilon}}\\ &\leq C\|\Phi_1\|^2_{\beta_\varepsilon}\left[\|W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\|_{\beta_\varepsilon} + \|\Phi_1\|_{\beta_\varepsilon}\right]^{2^*_m-3-\varepsilon}. \qquad (3.5)\end{aligned}$$

Thus by (3.5) and by Lemma 5 we have that

$$\|T_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(\Phi)\|_{H,s_\varepsilon} \leq \|\Phi\|^2_{H,s_\varepsilon} + C_{\alpha,\beta}|\varepsilon|\,|\log|\varepsilon||\,,$$

so if $\|\Phi\|_{H,s_\varepsilon} \leq 2C_{\alpha,\beta}|\varepsilon|\,|\log|\varepsilon||$ and for ε small $\|T_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(\Phi)\|_{H,s_\varepsilon} \leq 2C_{\alpha,\beta}|\varepsilon|\,|\log|\varepsilon||$. Moreover by (3.4) we have

$$\|T_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(\Phi_1) - T_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(\Phi_2)\|_{H,s_\varepsilon} \leq K\|\Phi_1-\Phi_2\|_{H,s_\varepsilon}$$

for some $K < 1$ if $\|\Phi_i\|_{H,s_\varepsilon} \leq 2C_{\alpha,\beta}|\varepsilon|\,|\log|\varepsilon||$ and ε small enough.

Therefore, a contraction mapping argument proves that the map $T_{\varepsilon,\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}$ admits a fixed point $\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}$. The regularity of $\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}$ with respect to η and t follows by standard arguments using the implicit function theorem. □

4. The reduced problem and proof of Theorem 2

Let $J_\varepsilon : H_\varepsilon \to \mathbb{R}$ be the energy associated to problem (1.5) defined by

$$J_\varepsilon(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_M a(x)\left(|\nabla_g u|^2 + h(x)u^2\right)d\mu_g - \frac{1}{2^*_m-\varepsilon}\int_M a(x)\left(u^+\right)^{2^*_m-\varepsilon}d\mu_g. \qquad (4.1)$$

It is well known that any critical point of J_ε is a solution to problem (1.5).

Let us introduce the reduced energy

$$\tilde{J}_\varepsilon(t,\eta) := J_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta} + \Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)$$

where $W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}$ is defined in (2.4), $\delta_\varepsilon(t) = \sqrt{|\varepsilon|t}$ (see (2.5)) and $\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}$ is given in Proposition 6.

Proposition 7. (i) *If (t,η) is a critical point of $\tilde{J}_\varepsilon$, then $W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}$ is a solution of (2.6) and then is a solution of problem (1.5).*

(ii) *We have*

$$\tilde{J}_\varepsilon(t,\eta) = a(\xi_0)\left[a_m - b_m\varepsilon\log|\varepsilon| + c_m\varepsilon + d_m|\varepsilon|\Phi(t,\eta)\right] + o(|\varepsilon|) \tag{4.2}$$

C^1-*uniformly with respect to* $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^m$ *and* $t \in [\alpha,\beta]$.

Here

$$\Phi(t,\eta) = \left\{ \frac{2(m-1)}{(m-2)(m-4)}\left[h(\xi_0) - \frac{m-2}{4(m-1)}S_g(\xi_0) + \frac{3(m-2)}{2(m-1)}\frac{\Delta_g a(\xi_0)}{a(\xi_0)}\right] + \frac{1}{2}\frac{D_g^2 a(\xi_0)[\eta,\eta]}{a(\xi_0)} \right\} t$$
$$- \frac{\varepsilon}{|\varepsilon|}\frac{(m-2)^2}{8}\log t \tag{4.3}$$

and $a_m,\dots,d_m$ *are constants which only depend on* m.

Proof. The proof of [i] is quite standard and can be obtained arguing exactly as in the proof of Proposition 2.2 of [9].

The proof of [ii] follows in two steps.

Step 1 We prove that

$$\tilde{J}_\varepsilon(t,\eta) = J_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right) + o(|\varepsilon|)$$

C^1-uniformly with respect to $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $t \in [\alpha,\beta]$.

Proof. First, let us prove the C^0-estimate. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{J}_\varepsilon(t,\eta) - J_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)\\
&= \int_M a(x)\left(\nabla_g W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\nabla_g\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta} + hW_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta} - f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta})\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)d\mu_g\\
&\quad - \int_M a(x)\left(\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)^{2^*-\varepsilon} - \left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)^{2^*-\varepsilon} - f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta})\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)d\mu_g\\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\|\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\|_H^2
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_M a(x)\nabla_g W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\nabla\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}d\mu_g = &-\int_M \nabla_g a(x)\nabla_g W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}d\mu_g\\
&-\int_M a(x)\Delta_g W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}d\mu_g
\end{aligned}$$

we need an estimate of the term

$$\int_M \nabla_g a(x)\nabla_g W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}d\mu_g.$$

By (3.3) we get that

$$\|\nabla_g a(x)\nabla_g W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\|_{\frac{2m}{m+2}} = O(|\varepsilon|)$$

and, by Holder inequality and by Proposition 6 we obtain

$$\left|\int_M \nabla_g a(x)\nabla_g W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}d\mu_g\right| = o(|\varepsilon|).$$

The following estimate is analogous to (4.11) in [[9], Lemma 4.2]: for any $\theta \in (0,1)$

$$\|-\Delta_g W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta} + hW_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta} - f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta})\|_{\frac{2m}{m+2}} = o(|\varepsilon|^\theta).$$

Thus

$$\left|\int_M a(x)\left(-\Delta_g W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta} + hW_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta} - f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta})\right)\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}d\mu_g\right| = o(|\varepsilon|).$$

Similarly, following again [[9], Lemma 4.2] it is easy to prove that

$$\left|\int_M a(x)\left(\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)^{2^*-\varepsilon} - \left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)^{2^*-\varepsilon} - f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta})\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)d\mu_g\right| = o(|\varepsilon|).$$

that concludes the proof of the C^0-estimate.

Let us prove the C^1-estimate. We point out that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(x) = \frac{1}{2t}Z^0_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(x) \tag{4.4}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_k}W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(x) = Z^k_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}(x) \text{ for } 1 \le k \le m \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$\|Z^k_{\delta,\eta}\|^2_H \to a(\xi_0)\|V_k\|_{D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^m)} \text{ for } 0 \le k \le m. \tag{4.6}$$

We have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}J_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}J_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_k}J_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_k}J_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right) \text{ for } 1 \le k \le m.$$

By (4.4) and (4.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial t}J_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}J_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)\\
&= \left(J'_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right) - J'_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)\right)\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t}W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right]\\
&\quad + J'_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right]\\
&= \left(J'_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right) - J'_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)\right)\left[\frac{1}{2t}Z^0_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right]\\
&\quad + J'_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_k}J_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_k}J_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)\\
&= \left(J'_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right) - J'_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)\right)\left[Z^k_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right]\\
&\quad + J'_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_k}\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

For $0 \le k \le m$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(J'_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right) - J'_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)\right)\left[Z^k_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right]\\
&= -\int_M \nabla_g a(x)\nabla_g Z^k_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}d\mu_g\\
&\quad + \int_M a(x)\left(-\Delta_g Z^k_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta} + hZ^k_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta} - f'_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta})Z^k_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}d\mu_g\\
&\quad + \int_M a(x)\left(f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}) - f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}) - f'_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta})\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)Z^k_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}d\mu_g.
\end{aligned}$$

At this point, by (4.6), we have

$$\left|\int_M \nabla_g a(x)\nabla_g Z^k_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}d\mu_g\right| \le \|\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\|_{L^2}\|\nabla_g a(x)\nabla_g Z^k_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\|_{L^2} = o(|\varepsilon|).$$

Arguing as in (4.26) of [[9], Lemma 4.2] we have that, for $0 \le k \le m$, and for $\theta \in (0,1)$

$$\|-\Delta_g Z^k_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta} + hZ^k_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta} - f'_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta})Z^k_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\|_{\frac{2m}{m+2}} = O(|\varepsilon|^\theta).$$

This implies

$$\left|\int_M a(x)\left(-\Delta_g Z^k_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta} + hZ^k_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta} - f'_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta})Z^k_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}d\mu_g\right| = o(|\varepsilon|).$$

Again, arguing as in [[9], Lemma 4.2] we have

$$\left|\int_M a(x)\left(f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta})-f_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta})-f'_\varepsilon(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta})\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)Z^k_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}d\mu_g\right|=o(|\varepsilon|).$$

It remains to estimate the term $J'_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right]$. By (2.7), since $\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\in K^\perp_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}J'_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right]&=\sum_{j=0}^m\lambda^j_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\left\langle Z^j_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta},\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right\rangle_H\\&=-\sum_{j=0}^m\lambda^j_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\left\langle\frac{\partial}{\partial t}Z^j_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta},\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right\rangle_H\end{aligned}$$

By easy computation we have that $\left\|\frac{\partial}{\partial t}Z^j_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right\|_H=O(1)$ and $\left\|\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta_k}Z^j_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right\|_H=O(1)$ for all $1\le k\le m$. By [[9], Lemma 4.2] we have that $\sum_{j=0}^m\left|\lambda^j_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right|=O(|\varepsilon|^{1/2})$. This, in light of Proposition 6 ensures that

$$J'_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right]=o(|\varepsilon|).$$

The estimate for $J'_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta_k}\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right]$, $k\in[1,m]$ can be obtained in a similar way. This concludes the proof. □

Step 2 We prove that $J_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)$ satisfies expansion (4.2) C^1-uniformly with respect to $\eta\in\mathbb{R}^m$ and $t\in[\alpha,\beta]$.

Proof. Let us prove the C^0-estimate.

It holds

$$\begin{aligned}J_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)=&a(\xi_0)\left(\underbrace{\frac12\int_M|\nabla_gW_{\delta,\eta}|^2d\mu_g}_{I_1}+\underbrace{\frac12\int_Mh(x)W^2_{\delta,\eta}d\mu_g}_{I_2}-\underbrace{\frac{1}{2^*_m-\varepsilon}\int_MW^{2^*_m-\varepsilon}_{\delta,\eta}d\mu_g}_{I_3}\right)\\&+\underbrace{\frac12\int_M(a(x)-a(\xi_0))|\nabla_gW_{\delta,\eta}|^2d\mu_g}_{I_4}+\underbrace{\frac12\int_M(a(x)-a(\xi_0))h(x)W^2_{\delta,\eta}d\mu_g}_{I_5}\\&-\underbrace{\frac{1}{2^*_m-\varepsilon}\int_M(a(x)-a(\xi_0))W^{2^*_m-\varepsilon}_{\delta,\eta}d\mu_g}_{I_6}.\end{aligned}$$

First of all, let us estimate the integrals I_1, I_2 and I_3.

$$\begin{aligned}I_1=&\frac{\delta^{-m+2}}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}g^{ij}(y)\frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}\left(\chi(y-\delta\eta)U\left(\frac{y}{\delta}-\eta\right)\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}\left(\chi(y-\delta\eta)U\left(\frac{y}{\delta}-\eta\right)\right)|g(y)|^{1/2}dy\\=&\frac12\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}g^{ij}(\delta(z+\eta))\frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}\left(\chi(\delta z)U(z)\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}\left(\chi(\delta z)U(z)\right)|g(\delta(z+\eta))|^{1/2}dz\\=&\frac12\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}g^{ij}(\delta(z+\eta))\frac{\partial U}{\partial z_i}(z)\frac{\partial U}{\partial z_j}(z)|g(\delta(z+\eta))|^{1/2}dz+o(\delta^2)\\=&\frac12\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(\delta_{ij}+\frac{\delta^2}{2}\sum_{i,j,r,k=1}^n\frac{\partial^2g^{ij}}{\partial y_r\partial y_k}(0)(z_r+\eta_r)(z_k+\eta_k)\right)\frac{\partial U}{\partial z_i}(z)\frac{\partial U}{\partial z_j}(z)\times\\&\times\left(1-\frac{\delta^2}{4}\sum_{s,r,k=1}^n\frac{\partial^2g^{ss}}{\partial y_r\partial y_k}(0)(z_r+\eta_r)(z_k+\eta_k)\right)dz+o(\delta^2)\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
=&\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|\nabla U|^2dz+\frac{|\varepsilon|t}{4}\sum_{i,j,r,k=1}^{m}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ij}}{\partial y_r\partial y_k}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\frac{\partial U}{\partial z_i}(z)\frac{\partial U}{\partial z_j}(z)z_rz_kdz\\
&+\frac{|\varepsilon|t}{4}\sum_{i,j,r,k=1}^{m}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ij}}{\partial y_r\partial y_k}(0)\eta_r\eta_k\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\frac{\partial U}{\partial z_i}(z)\frac{\partial U}{\partial z_j}(z)dz\\
&-\frac{|\varepsilon|t}{8}\sum_{s,k=1}^{m}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ss}}{\partial y_k^2}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|\nabla U|^2z_k^2dz\\
&-\frac{|\varepsilon|t}{8}\sum_{s,r,k=1}^{m}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ss}}{\partial y_r\partial y_k}(0)\eta_r\eta_k\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|\nabla U|^2dzdz+o(\varepsilon)\\
=&\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|\nabla U|^2dz+\frac{|\varepsilon|t}{4}\sum_{i,j,r,k=1}^{m}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ij}}{\partial y_r\partial y_k}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(\frac{U'(z)}{|z|}\right)^2z_iz_jz_rz_kdz\\
&+\frac{|\varepsilon|t}{4}\sum_{i,r,k=1}^{m}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ii}}{\partial y_r\partial y_k}(0)\eta_r\eta_k\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(\frac{U'(z)}{|z|}\right)^2z_i^2\\
&-\frac{|\varepsilon|t}{8}\sum_{i,k=1}^{m}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ii}}{\partial y_k^2}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(U'(z)\right)^2z_k^2dz\\
&-\frac{|\varepsilon|t}{8}\sum_{i,r,k=1}^{m}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ii}}{\partial y_r\partial y_k}(0)\eta_r\eta_k\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(U'(z)\right)^2dz+o(\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}
$$

We set $\tilde{h}(y)=h(\exp_{\xi_0}(y))$. Then we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_2=&\frac{\delta^{-m+2}}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\tilde{h}(y)\chi^2(y-\delta\eta)U^2\left(\frac{y}{\delta}-\eta\right)|g(y)|^{1/2}dy\\
=&\frac{\delta^2}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\tilde{h}(\delta(z+\eta))U^2(z)|g(\delta(z+\eta))|^{1/2}dz+o(\delta^2)\\
=&\frac{\delta^2}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(\tilde{h}(0)+O(\delta)\right)U^2(z)(1+O(\delta^2))dz+o(\delta^2)\\
=&\frac{|\varepsilon|t}{2}\tilde{h}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}U^2(z)dz+o(\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}
$$

We notice that, by direct computation, and considering that $\delta=\sqrt{|\varepsilon|t}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2_m^*-\varepsilon}&=\frac{1}{2_m^*}+\frac{\varepsilon}{\left(2_m^*\right)^2}+o(\varepsilon);\\
\delta^{\varepsilon\frac{m-2}{2}}&=1+\frac{m-2}{4}\varepsilon\log\left(|\varepsilon|t\right)+o(\varepsilon);\\
U^{2_m^*-\varepsilon}&=U^{2_m^*}-\varepsilon U^{2_m^*}\log U+o(\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_3=&\frac{\delta^{-\frac{m-2}{2}(2_m^*-\varepsilon)}}{2_m^*-\varepsilon}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\chi^{2_m^*-\varepsilon}(y-\delta\eta)U^{2_m^*-\varepsilon}\left(\frac{y}{\delta}-\eta\right)|g(y)|^{1/2}dy\\
=&\frac{\delta^{\varepsilon\frac{m-2}{2}}}{2_m^*-\varepsilon}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}U^{2_m^*-\varepsilon}(z)|g(\delta(z+\eta))|^{1/2}dz+o(\delta^2)\\
=&\frac{\delta^{\varepsilon\frac{m-2}{2}}}{2_m^*-\varepsilon}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}U^{2_m^*-\varepsilon}(z)\left(1-\frac{\delta^2}{4}\sum_{i,r,k=1}^{n}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ii}}{\partial y_r\partial y_k}(0)(z_r+\eta_r)(z_k+\eta_k)\right)dz+o(\delta^2)\\
=&\frac{\delta^{\varepsilon\frac{m-2}{2}}}{2_m^*-\varepsilon}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}U^{2_m^*-\varepsilon}(z)\left(1-\frac{\delta^2}{4}\sum_{i,r,k=1}^{n}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ii}}{\partial y_r\partial y_k}(0)(z_rz_k+\eta_r\eta_k)\right)dz+o(\delta^2)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \left(\frac{1}{2^*_m} + \frac{\varepsilon}{(2^*_m)^2}\right)\left(1 + \frac{m-2}{4}\varepsilon\log(|\varepsilon|t)\right)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(U^{2^*_m}(z) - \varepsilon U^{2^*_m}(z)\log U(z)\right)\\
&\quad\times\left(1 - \frac{|\varepsilon|t}{4}\sum_{i,r,k=1}^{n}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ii}}{\partial y_r\partial y_k}(0)(z_r z_k + \eta_r\eta_k)\right)dz + o(\varepsilon)\\
&= \frac{1}{2^*_m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} U^{2^*_m} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2^*_m}\left(\frac{1}{2^*_m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} U^{2^*_m}(z)dz - \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} U^{2^*_m}(z)\log U(z)dz\right)\\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2^*_m}\frac{m-2}{4}\varepsilon\log(|\varepsilon|t)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} U^{2^*_m}(z)dz +\\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2^*_m}\frac{|\varepsilon|t}{4}\sum_{i,r,k=1}^{m}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ii}}{\partial y_r\partial y_k}(0)\eta_r\eta_k\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} U^{2^*_m}(z)dz\\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2^*_m}\frac{|\varepsilon|t}{4}\sum_{i,k=1}^{m}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ii}}{\partial y_k^2}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} U^{2^*_m}(z)z_r^2 dz + o(\varepsilon)
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&I_1 + I_2 - I_3 = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|\nabla U|^2 dz - -\frac{1}{2^*_m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} U^{2^*_m}dz\\
&-\frac{1}{2^*_m}\frac{m-2}{4}\varepsilon\log(|\varepsilon|t)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} U^{2^*_m}(z)dz +\\
&-\frac{\varepsilon}{2^*_m}\left(\frac{1}{2^*_m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} U^{2^*_m}(z)dz - \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} U^{2^*_m}(z)\log U(z)dz\right)\\
&+\frac{|\varepsilon|t}{2}\tilde{h}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} U^2(z)dz\\
&+|\varepsilon|t\left(\frac{1}{4}\sum_{i,j,r,k=1}^{m}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ij}}{\partial y_r\partial y_k}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(\frac{U'(z)}{|z|}\right)^2 z_i z_j z_r z_k dz\right.\\
&\qquad\left.-\sum_{i,k=1}^{m}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ii}}{\partial y_k^2}(0)\left(\frac{1}{8}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(U'(z)\right)^2 z_k^2 dz + \frac{m-2}{8m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} U^{2^*_m}(z)z_r^2 dz\right)\right)\\
&+\underbrace{|\varepsilon|t\sum_{i,r,k=1}^{m}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ii}}{\partial y_r\partial y_k}(0)\eta_r\eta_k\left(\frac{m-2}{8m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} U^{2^*_m}(z)dz + \frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(\frac{U'(z)}{|z|}\right)^2 z_i^2 dz - \frac{1}{8}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(U'(z)\right)^2 dz\right)}_{=0}\\
&+o(\varepsilon)\\
&= \frac{K_m^{-m}}{m}\left[1 - \frac{(m-2)^2}{8}\varepsilon\log(|\varepsilon|t) - c_m\varepsilon + \frac{2(m-1)}{(m-2)(m-4)}\left(h(\xi) - \frac{(m-2)}{4(m-1)}S_g(\xi)\right)|\varepsilon|t + o(\varepsilon)\right],
\end{aligned}
$$

where c_m is a constant which only depends on m, $K_m := \sqrt{\frac{4}{m(m-2)\omega_m^{2/m}}}$ and ω_m is the volume of the unit $m-$sphere. (see also [[9], Lemma 4.1]). Here we used the following facts

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i,j=1}^{m}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ii}}{\partial z_j^2}(0) - \sum_{i,j=1}^{m}\frac{\partial^2 g^{ij}}{\partial z_i\partial z_j}(0) = S_g(\xi_0),\\
&\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|\nabla U|^2 z_i^2 dz - \frac{1}{2^*}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} U^{2^*} z_i^2 dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(\frac{\partial U}{\partial z_i}\right)^2 z_i^2 dz\\
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(\frac{U'(z)}{|z|}\right)^2 z_i^4 dz = 3\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(\frac{U'(z)}{|z|}\right)^2 z_i^2 z_j^2 dz\\
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(\frac{U'(z)}{|z|}\right)^2 z_i z_j z_k z_h dz = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(\frac{U'(z)}{|z|}\right)^2 z_1^4 dz(\delta_{ij}\delta_{hk} + \delta_{ik}\delta_{jh} + \delta_{ih}\delta_{jk}).
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, let us estimate the integrals I_4, I_5 and I_6. We set $\tilde{a}(y) = a(\exp_{\xi_0}(y))$ and we denote by $\frac{\partial \tilde{a}}{\partial y_s}$ the derivative of $\tilde{a}$ with respect to its s-th variable. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_4 &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} [\sum_{i,j} \tilde{a}(\delta(z+\eta)) - \tilde{a}(0)] g^{ij}(\delta(z+\eta)) \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}\left(\chi(\delta z)U(z)\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}\left(\chi(\delta z)U(z)\right) |g(\delta(z+\eta))|^{1/2} dz \\
&= \frac{\delta^2}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \sum_{s,k} \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{a}}{\partial y_s \partial y_k}(0)(z_s+\eta_s)(z_k+\eta_k)|\nabla U|^2 dz + o(\delta^2) \\
&= \sum_{s,k} \frac{\delta^2}{4}\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{a}}{\partial y_s \partial y_k}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} z_s z_k |\nabla U|^2 dz + \sum_{s,k} \frac{\delta^2}{4}\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{a}}{\partial y_s \partial y_k}(0)\eta_s\eta_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |\nabla U|^2 dz + o(\delta^2) \\
&= |\varepsilon| t \left\{ \frac{1}{4}\sum_k \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{a}}{\partial^2 y_k}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} z_k^2 |\nabla U|^2 dz + \sum_{s,k} \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{a}}{\partial y_s \partial y_k}(0)\frac{\eta_s\eta_k}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |\nabla U|^2 dz \right\} + o(\varepsilon) \\
&= |\varepsilon| t \left\{ \frac{1}{4m}\sum_{k=1}^m \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{a}}{\partial^2 y_k}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |z|^2 |\nabla U|^2 dz + \frac{1}{4}\sum_{k,s=1}^m \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{a}}{\partial y_s \partial y_k}(0)\eta_s\eta_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |\nabla U|^2 dz \right\} + o(\varepsilon).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

and by mean value theorem we get for some $\theta \in (0,1)$

$$\begin{aligned}
I_5 &= \frac{\delta^2}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} [\tilde{a}(\delta(z+\eta)) - \tilde{a}(0)]\tilde{h}(\delta(z+\eta))\chi^2(\delta z)U^2(z)|g(\delta(z+\eta))|^{1/2} dz \\
&= \frac{\delta^4}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \sum_{s,k} \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{a}}{\partial y_s \partial y_k}(\delta\theta z)\cdot(z_s+\eta_s)(z_k+\eta_k)\tilde{h}(\delta(z+\eta))\chi^2(\delta z)U^2(z) dz \\
&= O(\delta^3) = o(\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, using that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |z|^2 \left[U^{2^*_m - \varepsilon}(z) - U^{2^*_m}(z) \right] dz \right| \le |\varepsilon| \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |z|^2 U^{2^*_m - \theta\varepsilon}(z) \ln U(z) dz = o(1).$$

and also that

$$\frac{\delta^{\varepsilon\frac{m-2}{2}}}{2^*_m - \varepsilon} = \frac{1}{2^*_m - \varepsilon} + o(1) = \frac{1}{2^*_m} + o(1),$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
I_6 &= \frac{\delta^{\varepsilon\frac{m-2}{2}}}{2^*_m - \varepsilon}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} [\tilde{a}(\delta(z+\eta)) - \tilde{a}(0)]\chi^{2^*_m-\varepsilon}(\delta z)U^{2^*_m-\varepsilon}(z)|g(\delta(z+\eta))|^{1/2} dz \\
&= \frac{\delta^2}{2}\frac{\delta^{\varepsilon\frac{m-2}{2}}}{2^*_m - \varepsilon}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \sum_{s,k} \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{a}}{\partial y_s \partial y_k}(0)(z_s+\eta_s)(z_k+\eta_k)U^{2^*_m-\varepsilon}(z) dz + o(\delta^2) \\
&= \frac{\delta^2}{2}\frac{\delta^{\varepsilon\frac{m-2}{2}}}{2^*_m - \varepsilon}\sum_{s,k} \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{a}}{\partial y_s \partial y_k}(0)\eta_s\eta_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} U^{2^*_m-\varepsilon}(z) dz \\
&+ \frac{\delta^2}{2}\frac{\delta^{\varepsilon\frac{m-2}{2}}}{2^*_m - \varepsilon}\sum_k \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{a}}{\partial y_k^2}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} z_k^2 U^{2^*_m}(z) dz + o(\delta^2) \\
&= \frac{|\varepsilon| t}{2\cdot 2^*_m}\left(\sum_k \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{a}}{\partial y_k^2}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} z_k^2 U^{2^*_m}(z) dz + \sum_{s,k} \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{a}}{\partial y_s \partial y_k}(0)\eta_s\eta_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} U^{2^*_m}(z) dz \right) + o(|\varepsilon|) \\
&= |\varepsilon| t \left(\frac{m-2}{4m^2}\sum_{k=1}^m \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{a}}{\partial y_k^2}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |z|^2 U^{2^*_m}(z) dz + \frac{m-2}{4m}\sum_{k,s=1}^m \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{a}}{\partial y_s \partial y_k}(0)\eta_s\eta_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} U^{2^*_m}(z) dz \right) + o(|\varepsilon|).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get

$$I_4+I_5-I_6=|\varepsilon|t\left\{\sum_{k=1}^m\frac{\partial^2\tilde{a}}{\partial y_k^2}(0)\left[\frac{1}{4m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|z|^2|\nabla U|^2dz-\frac{m-2}{4m^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|z|^2U^{2_m^*}(z)dz\right]\right.$$
$$\left.+\sum_{k,s=1}^m\frac{\partial^2\tilde{a}}{\partial y_s\partial y_k}(0)\eta_s\eta_k\left[\frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|\nabla U|^2dz-\frac{m-2}{4m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}U^{2_m^*}(z)dz\right]\right\}+o(|\varepsilon|).$$

A straightforward computation shows that

$$\frac{1}{4m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|z|^2|\nabla U|^2dz-\frac{m-2}{4m^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|z|^2U^{2_m^*}(z)dz=\frac{3K_m^{-m}}{m(m-4)}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|\nabla U|^2dz-\frac{m-2}{4m}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}U^{2_m^*}(z)dz=\frac{K_m^{-m}}{2m}.$$

It is enough to use the following ingredients. For any positive real numbers p and q such that $p-q>1$, we let

$$I_p^q=\int_0^{+\infty}\frac{r^q}{(1+r)^p}dr.$$

In particular, there hold

$$I_{p+1}^q=\frac{p-q-1}{p}I_p^q\quad\text{and}\quad I_{p+1}^{q+1}=\frac{q+1}{p-q-1}I_{p+1}^q\,.$$

Moreover, we have

$$I_{\frac{m}{2}}^{\frac{m}{2}}=\frac{2K_m^{-m}}{\alpha_m^2(m-2)^2\omega_{m-1}}\,.$$

Finally, we collect all the previous estimates and we get the C^0-estimate, taking into account that

$$\Delta_g a(\xi_0)=\sum_{k=1}^m\frac{\partial^2\tilde{a}}{\partial y_k^2}(0)\text{ and }D_g^2a(\xi_0)[\eta,\eta]=\sum_{k,s=1}^m\frac{\partial^2\tilde{a}}{\partial y_k\partial y_s}(0)\eta_k\eta_s.$$

Let us prove the C^1- estimate.

We first consider the derivative of the term $A(\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta)=\frac{1}{2}\int_M a(x)|\nabla_g W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}|^2d\mu_g$ with respect to t. Since $\delta_\varepsilon'(t)\delta_\varepsilon(t)=\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ we get

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}A(\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta)=\delta_\varepsilon'(t)\frac{\partial}{\partial\delta}A(\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta)=$$
$$=\frac{\delta_\varepsilon'(t)}{2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\delta}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\tilde{a}(\delta(z+\eta))g^{ij}(\delta(z+\eta))\frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}\left(\chi(\delta z)U(z)\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}\left(\chi(\delta z)U(z)\right)|g(\delta(z+\eta))|^{1/2}dz$$
$$=\frac{\delta_\varepsilon'(t)}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\frac{\partial\tilde{a}}{\partial y_k}(\delta(z+\eta))(z_k+\eta_k)g^{ij}(\delta(z+\eta))\frac{\partial U(z)}{\partial z_i}\frac{\partial U(z)}{\partial z_j}|g(\delta(z+\eta))|^{1/2}dz$$
$$+\frac{\delta_\varepsilon'(t)}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\tilde{a}(\delta(z+\eta))\frac{\partial^2g^{ij}}{\partial y_k}(\delta(z+\eta))(z_k+\eta_k)\frac{\partial U(z)}{\partial z_i}\frac{\partial U(z)}{\partial z_j}dz$$
$$+\frac{\delta_\varepsilon'(t)}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\tilde{a}(\delta(z+\eta))g^{ij}(\delta(z+\eta))\frac{\partial U(z)}{\partial z_i}\frac{\partial U(z)}{\partial z_j}\frac{\partial|g|^{1/2}}{\partial y_k}(\delta(z+\eta))(z_k+\eta_k)dz+o(\varepsilon)$$
$$=\frac{\delta_\varepsilon'(t)\delta}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\frac{\partial^2\tilde{a}}{\partial y_k\partial y_r}(0)(z_r+\eta_r)(z_k+\eta_k)|\nabla U(z)|^2dz$$
$$+\frac{\delta_\varepsilon'(t)\delta}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\tilde{a}(0)\frac{\partial^2g^{ij}}{\partial y_k\partial y_r}(0)(z_r+\eta_r)(z_k+\eta_k)\frac{\partial U(z)}{\partial z_i}\frac{\partial U(z)}{\partial z_j}dz$$
$$-\frac{\delta_\varepsilon'(t)\delta}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\tilde{a}(0)|\nabla U(z)|^2\frac{\partial^2g^{ss}}{\partial y_k\partial y_r}(0)(z_r+\eta_r)(z_k+\eta_k)dz+o(\varepsilon)$$
$$=\frac{\varepsilon}{4}\frac{\partial^2\tilde{a}}{\partial y_k\partial y_r}(0)\eta_k\eta_r\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|\nabla U(z)|^2dz+\frac{\varepsilon}{4}\frac{\partial^2\tilde{a}}{\partial z_k^2}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|\nabla U(z)|^2z_k^2dz$$

$$+\frac{\varepsilon}{4}\tilde{a}(0)\eta_k\eta_r\frac{\partial^2 g^{ii}}{\partial y_k\partial y_r}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(\frac{U'(z)}{|z|}\right)^2 z_i^2dz$$
$$+\frac{\varepsilon}{4}\tilde{a}(0)\frac{\partial^2 g^{ij}}{\partial y_k\partial y_r}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(\frac{U'(z)}{|z|}\right)^2 z_iz_jz_kz_rdz$$
$$-\frac{\varepsilon}{8}\tilde{a}(0)\eta_k\eta_r\frac{\partial^2 g^{ss}}{\partial y_k\partial y_r}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|\nabla U(z)|^2dz-\frac{\varepsilon}{8}\tilde{a}(0)\frac{\partial^2 g^{ss}}{\partial y_k^2}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|\nabla U(z)|^2z_k^2dz+o(\varepsilon)$$

Here we recognize the derivative of I_1 with respect to t.

In a similar way we consider $\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta_k}A(\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta)$ for $1\le k\le m$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta_k}A(\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta)=&\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\partial\eta_k}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\tilde{a}(\delta(z+\eta))g^{ij}(\delta(z+\eta))\frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}\left(\chi(\delta z)U(z)\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}\left(\chi(\delta z)U(z)\right)|g(\delta(z+\eta))|^{1/2}dz\\
=&\frac{\delta}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\frac{\partial\tilde{a}}{\partial y_k}(\delta(z+\eta))g^{ij}(\delta(z+\eta))\frac{\partial U(z)}{\partial z_i}\frac{\partial U(z)}{\partial z_j}|g(\delta(z+\eta))|^{1/2}dz\\
&+\frac{\delta}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\tilde{a}(\delta(z+\eta))\frac{\partial^2 g^{ij}}{\partial y_k}(\delta(z+\eta))\frac{\partial U(z)}{\partial z_i}\frac{\partial U(z)}{\partial z_j}dz\\
&+\frac{\delta}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\tilde{a}(\delta(z+\eta))(\delta(z+\eta))\frac{\partial U(z)}{\partial z_i}\frac{\partial U(z)}{\partial z_j}\frac{\partial|g|^{1/2}}{\partial y_k}(\delta(z+\eta))dz+o(\varepsilon)\\
=&\frac{\delta^2}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\frac{\partial^2\tilde{a}}{\partial y_k\partial y_r}(0)(z_r+\eta_r)|\nabla U(z)|^2dz\\
&+\frac{\delta^2}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\tilde{a}(0)\frac{\partial^2 g^{ij}}{\partial y_k\partial y_r}(0)(z_r+\eta_r)\frac{\partial U(z)}{\partial z_i}\frac{\partial U(z)}{\partial z_j}dz\\
&-\frac{\delta^2}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\tilde{a}(0)|\nabla U(z)|^2\frac{\partial^2 g^{ss}}{\partial y_k\partial y_r}(0)(z_r+\eta_r)dz+o(\varepsilon)\\
=&\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\frac{\partial^2\tilde{a}}{\partial y_k\partial y_r}(0)\eta_r\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|\nabla U(z)|^2dz+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\tilde{a}(0)\eta_r\frac{\partial^2 g^{ii}}{\partial y_k\partial y_r}(0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\left(\frac{U'(z)}{|z|}\right)^2z_i^2dz\\
&-\frac{\varepsilon}{4}\tilde{a}(0)\eta_r\frac{\partial^2 g^{ss}}{\partial y_k\partial y_r}\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}|\nabla U(z)|^2dz+o(\varepsilon)\end{aligned}$$

Here we recognize the derivative of I_1 with respect to η_k.

We argue in a similar way for the all the other addenda in $J_\varepsilon\left(W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}\right)$. The claim follows easily. □

□

Proof of the Theorem 2. Set $\Theta(\xi_0):=h(\xi_0)-\frac{m-2}{4(m-1)}S_g(\xi_0)+\frac{3m(m-2)}{2(m-1)}\frac{\Delta_g\omega(\xi_0)}{\omega(\xi_0)}$. Let

$$\text{either } t_0:=\frac{b_m}{\Theta(\xi_0)} \text{ if } \varepsilon>0 \text{ or } t_0:=-\frac{b_m}{\Theta(\xi_0)} \text{ if } \varepsilon<0.$$

Since ξ_0 is a non degenerate critical point of ω, a straightforward computation shows that the point $(t_0,0)$ is a non degenerate critical point of the function Φ. Therefore, by (ii) of Proposition 7, if ε is small enough there exists $(t_\varepsilon,\eta_\varepsilon)\in(0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^m$ which is a critical point of $\widetilde{J}_\varepsilon$ such that $(t_\varepsilon,\eta_\varepsilon)\to(t_0,0)$ as $\varepsilon\to0$. Finally, by (i) of Proposition 7, we deduce that $W_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}+\Phi_{\delta_\varepsilon(t),\eta}$ is a solution of problem (1.5) which blows-up at the point ξ_0 as $\varepsilon\to0$. □

References

[1] T. Aubin, *Problèmes isopérimétriques et espaces de Sobolev*, J. Differential Geom. **11** (1976), no. 4, 573–598.

[2] ———, *Equations différentielles non linéaires et problème de Yamabe concernant la courbure scalaire*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **55** (1976), no. 3, 269–296.

[3] R.L. Bishop and B. O'Neill, *Manifolds of negative curvature.*, TAMS **145** (1969), 1–49.

[4] J. Davila, A. Pistoia, and G. Vaira, *(in preparation).*

[5] F. Dobarro and E. Lami Dozo, *Scalar curvature and warped products of Riemann manifolds*, TAMS **303** (1987), 161–168.
[6] O. Druet, *From one bubble to several bubbles: the low-dimensional case*, J. Differential Geom. **63** (2003), no. 3, 399–473.
[7] ———, *Compactness for Yamabe metrics in low dimensions*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **23** (2004), 1143–1191.
[8] P. Esposito, A. Pistoia, and M. Vetóis, *The effect of linear perturbations on the Yamabe problem*, Math. Annalen. (to appear).
[9] A.M. Micheletti, A. Pistoia, and M. Vetóis, *Blowup solutions for asymptotically critical elliptic equations on Riemannian manifolds*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **58** (2004), no. 4, 1719–1746.
[10] R. M. Schoen, *Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to constant scalar curvature*, J. Differential Geom. **20** (1984), no. 2, 479–495.
[11] N. S. Trudinger, *Remarks concerning the conformal deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa (3) **22** (1968), 265–274.
[12] H. Yamabe, *On a deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds*, Osaka Math. J. **12** (1960), 21–37.